they please. To stay here in London, that is the chiefe busi-nesse they come about, wee have gotten now (by Gods bles-sing upon our Forces) such an advantage against them, that they would faine do something (if it were possible) to hinder the going thereof. Peace is sweet, but to hug an inveterate Enemy in our bosome is dangerous. Remember their last co-ming to Sommerset-House, they do not forget it, it makes them desire to be here againe; but it were better for us to be rid of those we have here already.

The relieving of Youghall is confirmed, and moreover that Sir *Charles Coot* hath fallen upon a party of the Rebells, commanded by an Irish Bishop, and killed, taken and routed them all; so that upon dispatch of further supplies, and the government setled, it is hoped that Kingdome will be in too good a condition for the Rebells to have men to spare for the supply of the King in England.

The Letter from the Generall speaks how much the soul-diers want cloathes, which the Parliament have now taken into consideration and ordered 6000. sutes.

The forces are marching out to take in Corfe-castle, and Portland, and then to joyne in a body for the taking in of those Garrisons that shall remaine of the Kings in the heart of the Kingdome, whilest the Army reduceth the West, which designe goes on well: have but patience and see how the ene-my will fall there.

There is good hopes of Chester, Newarke, Skipton, and Belvoyr, and another place of so great consequence that the privacy of the design requires silence.

Printed for *R. A.* and *F C.* 1645.

they please. To stay here in London, that is the chiefe busi-nesse they come about, wee have gotten now (by Gods bles-sing upon our Forces) such an advantage against them, that they would faine do something (if it were possible) to hinder the going thereof. Peace is sweet, but to hug an inveterate Enemy in our bosome is dangerous. Remember their last co-ming to Sommerset-House, they do not forget it, it makes them desire to be here againe; but it were better for us to be rid of those we have here already.

The relieving of Youghall is confirmed, and moreover that Sir *Charles Coot* hath fallen upon a party of the Rebells, commanded by an Irish Bishop, and killed, taken and routed them all; so that upon dispatch of further supplies, and the government setled, it is hoped that Kingdome will be in too good a condition for the Rebells to have men to spare for the supply of the King in England.

The Letter from the Generall speaks how much the soul-diers want cloathes, which the Parliament have now taken into consideration and ordered 6000. sutes.

The forces are marching out to take in Corfe-castle, and Portland, and then to joyne in a body for the taking in of those Garrisons that shall remaine of the Kings in the heart of the Kingdome, whilest the Army reduceth the West, which designe goes on well: have but patience and see how the ene-my will fall there.

There is good hopes of Chester, Newarke, Skipton, and Belvoyr, and another place of so great consequence that the privacy of the design requires silence.

Printed for *R. A.* and *F C.* 1645.

18

THE FALLACY OF INFANTS BAPTISME DISCOVERED.

OR,

Five ARGUMENTS, to prove that INFANTS ought not to be baptized.

Delivered in private by Captain HOBSON, who should that day (with Master *Knowls*, and some others;) have discussed the thing in publike with Master *Callamy*, and Master *Cranford*, &c.

And now published for the benefit of those that seeke the truth in love.

Col.2.23. *Which things have indeed a shew of wisdome in will worship.*
Isai.1.12. *Who hath required this at your hands?*

LONDON,
Printed in the yeer of Discoveries. 1645.

THE FALLACY OF INFANT BAPTISM DISCOVERED.

Five Arguments, to prove that Infants ought not to be baptized.

Delivered in private by Christian Order to such People as desired the same in public by Publick Authority.

And Matter Grounded, &c.

And now published for the benefit of those that seek the truth in love.

London:

Printed in the Year of Discovery. 16[illegible]

To the courteous Reader.

READER,

I Who am one that waits upon Truth, desiring to know Truth, but am not to be considered under any of those names of distinction, as a member of any Independent Congregation, or one that they call an Anabaptist, *but a friend to them and others, so far as they are one with the Truth: I having by a providence, had an oportunity to hear one Captain* Hobson *(with two Ministers more) in private, who should have disputed in publike with Master* Callamy *and some others, about the point of Baptisme, having taken the heads of what Captain* Hobson *delivered, and*

conceiving that the good which I received by it, should engage me to communicate it to others, I was therefore willing to put it forth in print. But I desire you (Christian Reader) that you would consider that it is but the heads of what hee delivered, as I tooke it from him in short-hand, and therefore if there be any broken expressions in it, attribute it not to him, but to me, who am not so well skild (as in understanding, so) in writing Syllogismes, which (I understand) he was enjoyned so to speak, had he spoke in publike, and he seemed to be willing to speake in private, as he should have done there. There was two Ministers more who exercised also, whose arguments were worthy the printing, could I have taken them so as to bring them out, but not taking of them so perfectly,

ſelfly, I was loath to diſhonour that truth that I believe was in them.

My deſire is, that neither I nor you, may ſo look upon this, under the conſideration of that diviſion that ſeems to be amongſt men of Presbyterians and Anabaptiſts, and Separatiſts, but that theſe names of diſtinction may bee laid down, and that we may all as ſonnes of Truth, try every thing by the rules of Truth, and love each other in truth, which I know is that which would put an end to that great confuſion and trouble that I ſee abroad. And I hope when you have read this, you will ſee (as well as I) that we have for a long time been led in blindneſſe, taking that upon truſt, which now I ſee is contrary to Scripture, *even* Infants Baptiſme.

So

To the Reader.

So desiring you to passe by infirmities in it, and make a good construction of it, I leave you to Truth, desiring you not to have any prejudiciall thoughts against him that spake it, notwithstanding any infirmities you may see in him that writes it.

Yours in the

Lord Jesus,

S. S.

THE FALLACY OF INFANTS Baptisme discovered.

Deareſt Freinds:

SEeing a providence hath brought us together at this time, I ſhall therefore endevour, according to the intent of our meeting to declare my ſelfe, and ſo declare my ſelfe, that I may not only anſwer your expectations, but directly our intentions, in ſpeaking to the point in hand; which this day ſhould have been diſcuſſed in publike: But ſeeing a providence hath prevented us; and wee who thought to have been in publike, are now prevented by the Civill Magiſtrate, whom wee much honour; and with all willing Subjection, are willing to Obey in all things that croſſe not the *LORD JESUS CHRIST*: And truly here is that which ſtayes our ſpirits, though wee were willing to declare our Judgments in publike, to the view of Many; Yet if GOD will have it other wayes, herein is our Joy That the Truth knowes how beſt to make out it ſelfe; And if God by our Silence, will cauſe Truth to ſpeake, Wee rejoyce: Or if the time is not yet come to have things brought to a pub-

like

like View, Wee deſire to wayte upon God, knowing that his time is beſt to make out Truth to the Sons of men.

But before I addreſſe my ſelfe to what I intend to ſpeake, I deſire that you would give mee leave to ſpeake to two or three things:

Firſt, To deſire you not to thinke it ſtrange that not onely one, but two, or three ſhould ſpeak to one, and the ſame thing.

Secondly, That you would not think it ſtrange for us to trade ſo much in the ſhadow, in breaking up the ſhell, and not a little to trade in the kernell; My meaning is, that wee ſhould ſpeake ſo much of the outward Ordinance; and not enter into the unfolding of the ſweet, and glorious myſtery of God in Chriſt, wrapt up in the Ordinance, which is the Life as of the Ordinance, ſo of Saints while they are obſerving it.

Thirdly, I deſire that you would not thinke it ſtrange for mee to ſpeake to you, contrary to my wonted practice, which I ſhall at this time doe, onely ſpeaking in a Syllogiſticall way; for the truth is, I ſhall here endeavour to declare my ſelfe in private, as I did intend, to declare my ſelfe in publike; and the ſame grounds I intended to lay downe in publike, I ſhall lay downe here *Againſt the Baptizing of Infants.*

And the reaſon of my ſpeaking Syllogiſtically, is becauſe it was an Injunction laid upon us ſo, to ſpeake, had we met in publike.

But before I come to lay downe my Reaſons, I ſhall take a portion of Scripture, and draw a Concluſion, which Concluſion ſhall be as a Ground, from whence I purpoſe to build all my following Diſcourſe, the Scripture is.

Mat.

MUSEUM

MATTH. 28. 20.

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.

IN the words there are these two things considerable:

An Exhortation,
And a sweet Direction.

The Exhortation doth arise from the words considered in reference to the words before, (Verse 19.) *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations.*

The Direction in these words, *Teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you.*

In the Exhortation (if we had time) we might observe:

First, The Party exhorting; that's *Christ.*

Secondly, The Parties exhorted; That was the Disciples or Apostles, who were taught of *Christ.*

Thirdly, The matter exhorted to, Go teach.

From all which you may observe this Conclusion.

Doct. That it is the duty of all those who are taught of *Christ*, to declare to others what they enjoy from *Christ.*

But this is not that which I intend to build my following discourse upon. Therefore I passe it over.

And I come to the Direction, in which we may observe,

First, The Party directing.

Secondly, The Parties directed.

And Thirdly, The Direction it self.

First, The Party directing; That's *Christ*,

Secondly, The Parties directed; That is the Apostles, or the Disciples, in this word *Ye.*

And Thirdly, The Direction it self, in these words, *Go and teach them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you.*

That which I shall at this time speak of, is in the Direction it self; And from thence briefly observe with me these things.

Doct. 1. First, That the teachings of the Apostles concerning our duty to *Christ*, are the command of *Christ*: In these words, *Teach them to observe whatsoever I command you.* So that their teaching duty to *Christ*, was the command of *Christ.*

The second conclusion is from these words, *Teach them to observe whatsoever I command.*

Doct. 2. Thence observe, That the commands of *Christ* ought to be observed.

I might be large in speaking of this;

First, Because I see men are apt rather to observe the commands of men then the commands of *Christ*; and so do exceedingly slight and undervalue the commands of *Christ.*

Secondly, Because I apprehend that men are apt to mistake in the commands of *Christ*, and to take that for a command that is not; and to make that no command that is. But I shall not at this time speak of that.

The Third conclusion doth arise from something included in these words, *Teach them to observe what I command.* Implying not onely that we should observe *Christs* commands; But in observing any thing as a duty to *Christ*, it must be in reference to a command of *Christ.* From thence observe this conclusion.

Doct. 3. That all that we are to observe as a duty to *Christ*, must not arise from Supposition, but it must answer a command given out from *Christ.*

And at this time this is the conclusion I shall speak to; Explaining the terms, and confirming the Proposition; being that which I intend to build my following discourse upon.

And in opening the terms, I shall be very brief:

First, To shew you what is meant by the *Law* of *Christ*, or the commands of *Christ*.

Secondly, What I mean by Observation.

Thirdly, What I mean by Supposition.

Fourthly, The Reasons why we are to observe nothing as a duty to *Christ*, but that which answers a Law given forth by *Christ*.

1. What the Law of Christ or the Commands of Christ is.

First, By the commands of *Christ*, my meaning is, Not the Ceremonial Law, which was a Type of *Christ*, and did in a dark way hold forth *Christ*. Nay, by the Laws of *Christ*, or the commands of *Christ*, I do not intend the Moral Law considered in the hand of *Moses*: Though I must tell you first, I own the Authority of that Law: Secondly, I own the Materials of that Law: But the obligement of that Law, *Do and live*; (for so it was considered in the hand of *Moses*) So it is not to be considered in the hand of *Christ* to us; for now we are not to *do* for life; but because we *live*: But consider the Authority of God, and the Materials of the Law handed to us in *Christ*, so I own it, and desire all Saints may do so. But by the commands of *Christ*, my meaning is, All those commands that *Christ* gave as he was a Prophet, Priest, and King of his Church; either concerning our beleeving in God, or of our worshiping or walking with God. And so much of that thing.

2. What is meant by Observation.

Secondly, My meaning by observation, in a word is, *Actually*, and *Truely*, and *Really*, to do and conform to what *Christ* commands.

3. What is meant by Supposition.

And what I mean (in the Third place) by Supposition: By that I mean a doubtful apprehension that men gather up consequentially, by the strength of Reason and Art, and have no plain word for it. Now in such a case, Supposition of one side, is as strong as of the other: And if it be a duty to observe a thing under such a supposed consequence, then if there be a supposed consequence for the contrary, it is

also a duty to observe a thing contrary to that.

The Reasons why we are to observe nothing as a duty, but that which answers a Law, or Command of *Christ*.

But a duty doth not consist in answering a Supposition, but a command; And that it doth, I will prove from these Reasons.

Reason 1. First, Because nothing is a duty, but as it answers a command, *Luke* 17. 10.

Reason 2. Secondly, Every thing that we observe, doth directly answer that light which doth present the thing to us to be observed. If it be a supposed light, it is but a supposed duty; if a civil light presents to a civil man any truth of God, in his observation of it, it is but civil in reference to him; if a legal light presents an Evangelical truth, to a legal person, in his observation of it, it is legal in reference to him in his observing; if a self light present a real duty to an hypocrite, he observes it for self-ends. This you may see, *Zach.* 7. 5, 6. where he saith, *When ye fasted, did ye at all fast unto me, even to me?* So then if a man observes a thing onely from Supposition, and not a command, at the best, it is but a supposed duty.

Reason 3. But Thirdly, The will of Christ is, that as his Members are to *Beleeve* in light, so they should *do* in light, or *obey* in light, *Ephes.* 5. 8. But if we observe any thing barely from Supposition, and not from a command, it is observed in darkness, and not in light: Therefore not as a duty to be observed.

Reason 4. Fourthly, We are so to observe things that we present to Christ, that not onely the manner, but the matter should not come under the reproofs of Christ; But if we observe any thing as a duty to Christ, and have no command for it from Christ, it comes under the reproof of Christ; and he will one day say, *Who hath required this at your hands?* The Gospel forbids *Will-worship*. Now, *Will-worship* is not onely to do a thing contrary to a command; but to do a thing that is thought right or good by the wisdom of man; as Worship without a command, which the Apostle condemns, *Col.* 2.

Isai. 1. 12.

Fifthly.

Fifthly, Christ doth not only hold forth his Laws so as to declare duty; but so as that they may be sufficient to stop the mouths of them that oppose duty, *Matth.* 5. 16. But to observe any thing as a duty, and not from a command of Christ, but from Supposition; that is not sufficient to stop the mouths of them that oppose duty: Therefore ought not to be done; for you must know Suppositions (as I said before) are as strong of one side as of the other. *Reason 5.*

Sixthly, The sixth reason I shall draw from those words, *Rom.* 15. 4. where he saith, *What is written, is written for our learning*: I shall form my reason thus, That which is written the Saints should learn; But it is no where written That we should observe any thing as a duty, in reference to Supposition, but to answer a command: Therefore to observe any thing as a duty to Christ, without a command, is not a Doctrine for Saints to learn. *Reason 6.*

In the seventh place, I might give you one reason more, and that thus, That which answers the Love of Christ, and our friendly relation with Christ, that's duty and nothing else; But to observe any things not from Supposition, but to answer a Law or Command of Christ; that's that which answers to the Love of Christ, and our friendly relation with Christ, and therefore Duty, *John* 14. 23. *and* 15. 14. *Reason 7.*

These Reasons (dearest Friends) I have given to you to confirm what before I spake, which was, That we are to observe nothing as a duty to Christ, but that which answers a Law given forth by Christ.

I might here draw divers Uses, which might be useful for us; But at this time I shall onely speak of a Use of Reproof; To reprove those that will observe things, and in their observing, plead for it as a duty to Christ, and yet have no command for it from Christ: Amongst the rest, this is that which I shall here reprove, *The Baptizing of Infants*; which is the very point in controversie: And because I desire to speak directly to the *Question* as it was stated; I shall here rehearse to you what the *Question* was, and what *Use.*

they were to prove, and what we were to prove. The Question was, *Whether Infants of beleeving parents were to be Baptized, yea or no?* They were to prove *That it was their duty, and they ought so to do*: We were to prove *That they ought not to do it*.

I shall not at all go about to meddle with the justifying of our practice concerning the *Baptizing of Beleevers*; for that is not the point in hand. Though I must tell you, It had been but a reasonable thing for them by Scripture to endeavour to justifie their practice; and we by Scripture to justifie ours; and then neither of us would have been put upon the proof of a Negative, which every rational man knows is the worst end of the staff. But seeing it was so, I shall therefore direct my speech to give forth my judgement concerning that thing.

The Reasons that I shall at this time lay down (according to time and strength) Why children ought not to be Baptized, are these:

Argum. 1. The first is this:

That which doth (not only accidentally, but) directly deny Christ to be come in the flesh, That ought not to be done:

But the Baptizing of Infants doth directly deny Christ to be come in the flesh;

Therefore ought it not to be done.

I know that no man can deny the Major, which is so clearly confirmed, 1 *John* 4. 3. with divers other places.

But at this time I will prove the Minor, That Baptizing of Infants doth directly deny Christ to be come in the flesh; And that I prove thus:

That which doth keep on foot that which was before Christ, and ended by Christ, considered come in the flesh; that denies Christ to be come in the flesh:

But the Baptizing of Infants doth keep on foot that which was before Christ, and ended by Christ, as come in the flesh;

And

And therefore it denies Christ to be come in the flesh.

For the proof of this,

First, I shall unfold to you what I mean by that which was before Christ, and ended by Christ come in the flesh. That which was before Christ, was, That God made a Covenant with *Abraham*, which Covenant ran in the flesh, and was intail'd to generation; and not upon condition of Regeneration. And this you may see, *Gen.* 17. 7, 12. And this was that Covenant that Circumcision of Children had a reference to; And whosoever was a childe of *Abraham*, considered as a son of the flesh, had a right to it, and might, and did plead for privileges by it. But when Christ came, the natural Branches were cut off, *Rom.* 11. 20, 21. and no man is now considered a son of *Abraham*, or the Seed of *Abraham*, but as he believeth, *Gal.* 3. 7, 9, 14, 22, 28, 29. And now there is no promise that runs forth to any considered in reference to a carnal generation, but a spiritual Regeneration, *John* 3, 5. Therefore when they came to *John* (*Matth.* 3. 7, 8, 9.) to be Baptized, He takes them off from pleading their privilege considered in the flesh, and tells them, *Say not in your heart, You have Abraham to your Father*, and so plead for Baptism. But he exhorts them to *Believe and Repent.*

And by this you see what I mean by that which was before Christ, which was, The Promises and Covenant running in a natural line; but it is now ended, and runs in a spiritual. But now to Baptize Children, because their Parents Believe, and upon this ground, Because it was the same (as they say) with Circumcision; in so doing they go about to make the promises to run in a natural line, which was ended by Christ; And therefore in the observing of it, deny Christ to be come in the flesh.

Secondly,

That which doth directly take from Christ that which the Holy Ghost gives to Christ, considered come in the flesh; That denies Christ come in the flesh.

But

But the Baptizing of Infants doth directly take from Christ that which the Holy Ghost gives to Christ considered come in the flesh.

Therefore it denies Christ come in the flesh.

And for the proof of this, I shall declare to you what I mean by that which the Holy Ghost gives to Christ considered come in the flesh.

Col. 1. 18. Phil. 2. 9. The Holy Ghost gives to Christ a pre-eminence above all others that were before him in his Prophetical and Kingly Office.

Joh. 6. 68. Matth. 11. 9. Luke 24. 19. In his Prophetical Office, that neither *Moses* nor the Prophets were to be compared with him, but far inferiour to to him, and his Office; So inferiour, that he was not to be expounded by them; but in giving out his minde considered come in the flesh, he was to expound and unfold them. But now men in their going about to plead for the Baptizing of Infants, do exceedingly undervalue Christ's Prophetical Office in this, that they make the old Testament expound the new; whereas the new should expound the old; Christ should, and doth expound *Moses*; But there is no warrant for us to bring Christ under the Exposition of *Moses*; And men do undervalue the Lord Christ, in making *Moses* speak that which Christ speaks not, or bringing *Moses* to Christ, as a greater light to unfold the lesser; They do (I say) exceedingly undervalue Christ, and that thus.

Matth. 5. 21, 22, 27, 28. The Light unfolding, or the Wisdom unfolding, must be greater then the matter unfolded; And therefore he that goeth about to make *Moses* mouth to speak out Christ's minde, in things that concern Christ as come in the flesh, sets up *Moses* above Christ; and denies Christ to be come in the flesh.

Isai. 9. 6, 7. Revel. 15. 3. Secondly, They exceedingly take from Christ's Kingly Office; whereas the Holy Ghost sets up Christ a King in his Church, and a Law-giver, as equal to, so transcending all others that were before him; But that men in the Baptizing of Infants do undervalue the Kingly Office of Christ,

in giving Laws to his people. That's clear in these two things.

First in this, That they say it is a duty to Baptize Infants, and Answers the minde of Christ, and yet cannot shew a command from Christ; whereas the Apostle saith, *Christ was as faithful in his house, as Moses.* And you know the faithfulnesse of *Moses* did consist in this, That he gave Laws and Commands to the *Israelites*, to declare their duty: and layes nothing upon them as a duty, but what they had a command for. And if he gave them Laws for every thing they were to observe, and Christ was as faithful in his house as he; I will leave this to the judgement of you, whether or no that this doth not undervalue the Kingly Office of Christ, to say, that Baptizing of Infants is a duty that they owe to Christ; and yet can shew no command for it from Christ. Heb 3.2, 3.

Secondly, They undervalue the Kingly Office of Christ, in giving Laws to his Church in this; That they go about to perform (as they say) a duty to Christ; but can shew no command for it from Christ; but must use there own Art and Reason to make Christs Law strong enough to hold it out to be a duty. And whether the joyning of mans Art, Policy, and Reason to the Laws of Christ, doth not exceedingly undervalue Christ, as though his Laws were not perfect enough for his people, I leave you to judge. And in so doing they do exceedingly take (as before I said from the Prophetical, so here in the Kingly Office of Christ) that Honour and Preheminence from him, which the Holy Ghost gives to him, considered as come in the flesh: And therefore so to do, denies Christ as come in the flesh.

Secondly,

That which is no part of Righteousnesse, that as a duty to Christ, ought not to be observed.

But the Baptising of Infants is no part of Righteousnesse;

And therefore it ought not to be observed.

The Major Proposition none can deny, I will prove the Minor, and that thus.

Whatsoever is considered as a part of Righteousnesse, was seen either in the Person or Practice of Jesus Christ.

But neither in the Person nor Practice of Jesus Christ, is the Baptizing of Infants seen or held forth.

Therefore it is no part of Righteousnesse.

And that whatsoever is a part of Righteousnesse, was seen in the Person or Practice of Jesus Christ, is clear from this Scripture, *Matth.* 3. 15. *And Jesus said, Suffer it to be so: For thus it becometh us to fulfil all Righteousnesse.* If all Righteousnesse, then there was no Righteousnesse but was considered either in the Person or Practice of Christ. And that the *Baptizing of Infants* is not held out in the Person or Practice of Christ, I leave to you to judge. He himself was not Baptized when he was an Infant, though he might plead the same priviledge as they do who say they are Children of Believers: Had it been a part of Righteousnesse, Christ would, nay, Christ should have done it.

Object. If you Object, and say, There was none to Baptize him before:

Answ. I Answer, Had it been a part of Righteousnesse, God in providence would have provided one before, as well as then; for he was to *fulfil all Righteousnesse.* And for his Practice (*though he Baptized not, but his Disciples, John* 4. 2.) yet, in all their Baptizing where Christ was, you never hear that ever they *Baptized any Infant*, or gave any command for it; And therefore it is no part of Righteousnesse, and ought not to be done.

Ar. 3. Thirdly,

That which is not the Baptism of Christ, That ought not to be done.

But the Baptizing of Infants is not the Baptism of Christ;

And

And therefore ought not to be done. (We are now speaking of the Baptism of Christ, considered in an external way.)

And that the Baptism of Infants, is not the *Baptism of Christ* so considered; I prove thus.

First, That which doth not Answer the Commission of Christ, That is not the Baptism of Christ;

But, the Baptism of Infants doth not answer the Commission of Christ;

Therefore it is not the Baptism of Christ.

That it doth not answer the Commission of Christ, it is clear from the Commission it self, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. Where you shall see these things in the Commission, *Go teach, Discipling,* and *Baptizing.* And they that were to be Baptized, were such as must first be Taught, and Discipled, and being Beleevers, must be Baptized, *Mark* 16. 16.

And that an Infant in the first place, is capable to be Taught the mystery of the Gospel, and so to be taught as to be made a Disciple of Christ, and a Beleever in Christ. It is clear that it cannot be; and therefore the Baptizing of them, doth not answer the Commission of Christ.

Every man that professes to act by a Commission, must not onely do things because there is not an expresse command against it: But if they observe any thing as a duty, they must have a command for it, in, and by it; or else it will come under the reproof of him that gives the Commission; as those come under the reproof of Christ (*Colos.* 2.) who by the wisdom of men, went to present a Will-worship to God. And so you see the Baptizing of Infants doth not answer the Commission of Christ; And therefore it is none of Christs Baptism, and ought not to be done.

Secondly, Christs Baptism is a Baptism of Faith, and a Baptism of Repentance. Acts 8.37. Mark 16.16.

But, the Baptism of Infants cannot be a Baptism of Faith and a Baptism of Repentance; Acts 8.12. Acts 2.38. Acts 18.8.

Therefore it is not the Baptism of Christ; and ought not to be done.

Argum. 4. Fourthly,

That which causeth inconveniences in the Church, That ought not to be done.

But, the Baptizing of Infants doth cause inconveniences in the Church;

Therefore it ought not to be done.

I must tell you (dear Friends) for this Argument, I borrowed it from them that oppose the thing, who laid down this as an Argument for Baptizing of Infants; and that thus:

That which causeth inconveniences in the Church, That ought not to be done:

But, (say they) the denying of Childrens Baptism, causeth inconveniences in the Church; And therefore it ought not to be denied.

And to prove this, they go to prove a Supposition by a Supposition; and that thus:

It will make the Children of Beleevers (say they) to be no otherwayes then the Children of Heathens; and so they go about to prove a Consequence by a Consequence; which is but a meer vapour.

But that the Baptizing of Infants doth cause inconveniences in the Church, I will prove from Scripture: and that thus:

That which doth not onely present one, but make one a Member of a Church, before being called of God, That is inconvenient:

But, the Baptizing of Infants makes them Members of their Church, before they are called of God: And therefore it is inconvenient, and contrary to these Scriptures, 1 *Cor.* 1. 1. and 2 *Cor.* 1. 1.

Secondly,

That which intails mercies and priviledges to generation,

on, which alone is to be intail'd upon men in reference to regeneration, That is inconvenient.

But the Baptizing of Infants, doth intail mercies and priviledges to them in reference to generation, and not regeneration; And therefore it is inconvenient, and contrary to this Scripture, *John* 3.5. *Gal.*3.9. with many other places, as 2 *Cor.*1.1. where he doth declare that all those that were in the Church of Christ, and impriviledged with the Ordinances of Christ, they were sanctified by Christ.

Thirdly, That which causeth a Separation, and distraction in Christs conjunction; Thats inconvenient.

But, the Baptizing of Infants, doth make a Separation, and distraction in Christs conjunction; And therefore it is inconvenient.

By Christs conjunction, I mean the oneneſſe that is between the ground that Christ layes down for men to be Baptized, and the ground he layes down for men to break Bread; which is one and the same thing: He that Beleeves, and knows, and discerns Christ, he is to be Baptized, *Acts* 8.37. And he that doth so, is to break Bread, in remembrance of Christ, 1 *Cor.* 11.

Now, those that plead so much for the Baptizing of Infants, by the same ground they would Baptize Infants upon, they will not admit them nor others to break Bread; And therefore as Christs ground is one, theirs is two: And under that consideration, they make a Separation in that which Christ makes a oneneſſe; and that is inconvenient in the Church of Christ, and ought not to be done.

Fifthly, *Argum.* 5.

That which doth directly crosse the proceedings in the time of the Law, and in the time of the Gospel, That ought not to be done.

But, the Baptizing of Infants, doth directly crosse the proceedings in the time of the Law, and in the time of the Gospel; And therefore it ought not to be done.

By

Isai.8.20. By that, I mean, That no man in the time of the Law, and in the time of the Gospel was to do any thing by the vertue of a Right, without a Rule; But whatsoever they did as a Duty, it was to answer a Rule. Had *Abraham* been circumcised by the vertue of a Right, as he was a Beleever, and not by the vertue of a Rule; then *Lot* might have pleaded for the same priviledge, for he was a Beleever as well as *Abraham*; yet God did not make choice of *Lot*, but of *Abraham*. And then, *Ishmael* should not have been circumcised, but onely *Isaac*; But though *Ishmael* was a son of the flesh, and cast out by God, and not a Beleever in God; yet he must be circumcised: And therefore this was not by the vertue of a Right, but by the vertue of a Rule.

The same thing also was in the time of the Gospel, where it is clearly discovered that Christ owns nothing as a Duty, but as it answers a Law; and they were to do nothing, pleading a Right, without a Rule; but to do all things by the vertue of a Rule: Therefore under that consideration, Will-worship was condemned.

Now if there be any rule, or any command in the Scripture for Infants to be Baptized, I desire they would shew it: Here is the Word of Truth, which justifies all things sutable to it self; and owns nothing else to be a Truth. And I do exceedingly wonder that any men should go about to plead for a thing, by the vertue of a Right, without a Rule.

I have much more to say to you in this thing, had I time and strength: But, I hope these five grounds that I have here laid down, will clearly discover to you, That Infants ought not to be Baptized.

I am not here now to prove to you the Baptizing of Beleevers; That's not the controversie in hand, though a thing clear by Scripture; and that which I should be glad if I had an occasion to speak of. Not onely to speak of Baptism in the Letter, but Baptism in the Spirit, which was the mystery of the Gospel, and the glorious excellency of Christ in

the

the Spirit, held out in the Administrations of Christ considered in the flesh; which Administrations in the flesh, are as so many signes to declare the Mystery of the Spirit; though I know none can understand it, but they that do injoy it; for none can unletter the Letter, but the Spirit: But I cease from that, and cease giving you any further Reasons (at this time) to prove that which we were to have proved in Publike, had we had liberty; which was, *That Infants ought not to be Baptized.*

But I leave them and you so to the Truth; desiring that we may all be taught by the Truth; and sweetly made one in the Truth; and carried out from thence, to walk up in an acknowledgement of the Truth, sutable to the Rules of it Self.

FINIS.